

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, and made final, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-3, and 20-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, and 20-22 stand rejected. Claim 2 is objected to.


The rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended Claim 3 to properly depend from Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 3 under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The provisional rejection of Claims 1 and 20-22 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 7, 11, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,642 is respectfully traversed. Applicant has filed a terminal disclaimer filed concurrently herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 and 20-22 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 were objected to and were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 2 and 3 depend on Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 2 and 3 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2 and 3 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert B. Reesor III  
Registration No. 45,548  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070